

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 8-10. These sheets, which include Fig. 8-10, replaces the original sheets including Fig. 8-10. Figs. 8-10 have now been labeled as PRIOR ART.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In the Office Action issued December 5, 2005, claims 1-13 and 18-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite as being incomplete for omitting essential steps or elements. Claims 8 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Universal Serial Bus Mass Storage Class Bulk-only Transport Specification 1.0 (USB spec 1.0). Claims 1-7, 9-13, 18-24, and 26-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USB spec 1.0 in view of applicant's teaching of prior art. Claim 18 was objected to. Figs. 8-10 were objected to.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11-13, 18, 20-25, and 28-30 are now pending in this application. Claims 14-17 and 31-34 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, and 25 have been amended to correct typographical errors and to clarify the subject matter that the applicant considers to be the invention. Claims 2, 9, 10, 19, 26, 27, have been canceled. Figs. 8-10 have been amended.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-13 and 18-30 (now claims 1, 3-8, 11-13, 18, 20-25, and 28-30) under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, the applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The applicant believes that no essential steps have been omitted. For example, claim 1 recites transmitting a first packet which is not a STALL packet ..., receiving a second packet which is a response packet for a STALL packet ..., and transmitting a third packet ... which is the STALL packet The stimulus and response sequence of these steps is complete and coherent; no steps are missing that are essential to the performance of the recited steps. Likewise, the stimulus and response sequence of the steps of claim

8, as well as the structural arrangement of the elements of claims 18 and 25 are complete and coherent; no steps or elements are missing that are essential to the performance of the recited steps or the functioning of the recited structure. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection with respect to claims 1, 8, 18, and 25, and with respect to claims 3-7, 11-13, 20-24, and 28-30, which depend therefrom.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 8 and 25 is not anticipated by USB spec 1.0. USB spec 1.0 discloses receiving a STALL packet, transmitting a second request for data, and receiving a CSW packet in response. USB spec 1.0 does not disclose or suggest the requirement of the present invention, for example, according to claim 8, of receiving an ACK or NAK packet that is erroneously recognized as a STALL packet, transmitting a second request for data, and receiving a STALL packet. This required sequence is not disclosed or suggested anywhere in USB spec 1.0.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 8, and according to claim 25, which is similar to claim 8, is not anticipated by USB spec 1.0.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 1-7, 9-13, 18-24, and 26-30 (now 1, 3-7, 11-13, 18, 20-24, and 28-30) is not unpatentable over USB spec 1.0 in view of applicant's teaching of prior art because even if USB spec 1.0 and applicant's teaching of prior art were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the

result would not be the present invention, as claimed. Even if USB spec 1.0 and applicant's teaching of prior art were combined as suggested by the Examiner, that combination would still not disclose or suggest the requirement of the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, of transmitting a STALL packet in response to receiving a response for a STALL packet that was transmitted due to erroneous recognition of a packet that is not a STALL packet as a STALL packet. The combination of USB spec 1.0 and applicant's teaching of prior art does not disclose or suggest these required steps.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 3-7, 11-13, 18, 20-24, and 28-30, which are similar to claim 1, or which depend therefrom or from claims similar to claim 1, is not unpatentable over USB spec 1.0 in view of applicant's teaching of prior art.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19546.0046).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: May 5, 2006

Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500